

FY17 Brownfields Area-Wide Planning (BF AWP) Grant Program

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) to the FY17 BF AWP Grant Program Request for Proposals (RFP)

EPA BF AWP Program website: <https://www.epa.gov/brownfields/types-brownfields-grant-funding#tab-5>

Click for a list of FAQs on the following topics:

- [BF AWP Grant Program Background](#)
 - [Eligible Uses of BF AWP Grant Funds](#)
 - [Applicant Eligibility](#)
 - [General Guidelines](#)
 - [Threshold Criteria](#)
 - [Using Grants.gov](#)
-

BF AWP Grant Program Background

Q1. What is a brownfield site?

A1. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act (Brownfields Law), defines a brownfield at CERCLA § 101(39) as “...real property, the expansion, redevelopment or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant” and may include sites contaminated by controlled substances, petroleum, or mine-scarred land.

Q2. Why does the EPA offer the BF AWP grant program?

A2. The EPA works to respond to community brownfield issues with an environmental protection approach that is locally based, encourages strong public-private partnerships, and promotes innovative and creative ways to assess, clean up, and redevelop brownfield sites. This approach empowers state, tribal, and local officials to oversee brownfield activities, supports meaningful public participation, and encourages implementing local solutions to local problems.

Federal resources for brownfields are typically delivered site-by-site to assist with assessment and cleanup, which helps lead to subsequent site reuse. However, the burden of a single large site, or collective burden of multiple sites concentrated within an area (such as a neighborhood, district, city block or corridor), can weigh down an entire community. Environmental justice communities are particularly affected, as the cumulative effects of brownfields and blight exacerbate already unhealthy conditions. Where multiple sites are connected through location, infrastructure, economic, social and environmental conditions, the EPA encourages communities to take an area-wide approach to planning for the assessment and cleanup of these brownfields. This focus on multiple brownfield sites will result in more coordinated strategies for cleanup and area revitalization versus a single site focus.

To date the EPA has awarded BF AWP grants to 64 communities: 23 pilot grants in FY10, 20 grants in FY13, and 21 grants in FY15. These grants have enabled recipients¹ to conduct research and provide technical assistance, through which each of the recipients develop an area-wide plan for brownfield sites within their community. The purpose of the area-wide plan is to integrate the cleanup and reuse of brownfield sites in larger, coordinated efforts to revitalize their neighborhood. The resulting plans help identify implementation strategies for brownfields assessments, cleanup, reuse and other necessary investments/improvements in the area.

ELIGIBLE USES OF BF AWP GRANT FUNDS

Q3. For the purposes of this RFP, what is meant by “EPA grant funding”?

A3. EPA will award grant funding to successful applicants. Grants will be administered by EPA via a cooperative agreement with each recipient. Cooperative agreements permit substantial involvement between the EPA Project Officer and the selected applicant in the performance of the work supported.

Q4. What types of tasks and activities are considered eligible uses of EPA grant funds under this RFP?

A4. The BF AWP program provides grant funding for research and/or technical assistance to recipients to enable them to develop an area-wide plan for catalyst, high priority brownfield sites within the project area, and include strategies for specific next steps and resources needed for plan implementation.

See the RFP Section 1.A. for a list of common BF AWP grant-funded activities.

As part of their proposed BF AWP research and/or technical assistance activities, the EPA encourages applicants to consider how to connect brownfield(s) in the project area to:

- opportunities to address environmental justice concerns and promote sustainable and equitable development outcomes within the brownfield project area;
- opportunities to facilitate the reuse of existing infrastructure (e.g. transportation systems, utilities, waste water and drinking water systems, sewage systems, etc.), by taking into account infrastructure investments needed to support future uses of brownfield(s) properties as part of the assessment and cleanup process;
- strategies to involve different levels of government and community partners to ensure plan implementation occurs over time; and
- linkages to:
 - contaminated properties other than brownfields;
 - other land uses within the BF AWP project area (such as housing, job centers, and transit/alternative transportation), and

¹ Visit EPA’s website for more information: <https://www.epa.gov/brownfields/types-brownfields-grant-funding#tab-5>

- regional sustainability or planning efforts.

All research and/or technical assistance for area-wide planning must be designed to identify cleanup and reuse strategies for brownfields that will meet community health, environmental and economic development goals.

Q5. What types of tasks or activities are considered ineligible uses of EPA grant funds under this RFP?

A5. Please see Section 1.B. in the RFP for the list of ineligible uses of EPA grant funds under this RFP.

Q6. What is the Administrative Cost Prohibition?

A6. The Brownfields Law prohibits the use of any part of a grant or loan for the payment of an administrative cost. In implementing this prohibition, EPA has made a distinction between prohibited administrative costs and allowable programmatic costs.

Administrative Costs. Prohibited administrative costs are direct costs, including those in the form of salaries, benefits, contractual costs, supplies, and data processing charges, incurred to comply with most provisions of the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements For Federal Awards contained in 2 CFR Part 200. Direct costs for grant administration that fall within these areas are ineligible even if the grantee or subawardee is required to carry out the activity under the grant agreement. Prohibited administrative costs also include indirect costs the recipient incurs under the OMB Cost Principles found at 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E of the Uniform Grant Guidance. Please note that prohibited administrative costs also include the cost to prepare the applicant's proposal.

Management Fees. Management fees are also an unallowable cost. Recipients must not include management fees or similar charges in excess of the direct costs in budgets for Brownfields grants. The term "management fees or similar charges" refers to expenses added to the direct costs in order to accumulate and reserve funds for ongoing business expenses, unforeseen liabilities, or for other similar costs that are not allowable under Brownfields grants as administrative costs.

Programmatic Costs. EPA has determined that the administrative cost prohibition does not apply to "programmatic" costs, i.e., costs for activities that are integral to achieving the purpose of the grant. These costs are programmatic, not administrative. Direct costs for the following programmatic activities are not subject to the administrative cost prohibition:

- Eligible programmatic costs can include expenses for providing brownfield technical assistance to communities including necessary salary, travel, training, equipment, supplies, reference materials, subawards, and contractual support if those costs are reasonable and allocable to tasks specified in a grantee's approved scope of work for carrying out the activities described in the solicitation.

- Costs incurred for procurement of contractors necessary to provide brownfield technical assistance to communities. Costs for complying with the procurement standards of 2 CFR 200.317 through 200.326 are considered eligible programmatic costs only if:
 - the procurement contract is for services or products that are direct costs for performing activities specified in the solicitation, or
 - for performance and financial reporting required under 2 CFR 200.328. Performance and financial reporting are essential programmatic tools for both the recipient and EPA to ensure that grants are carried out in accordance with statutory and regulatory requirements.

For further information on these prohibitions, contact the EPA as listed in Section 7 of the RFP.

Q7. If my proposal is selected and I procure a contractor to assist with researching existing project area conditions, organize the draft brownfields area-wide plan, and/or work with the community to develop key implementation strategies and next steps, does the prohibition on administrative costs prevent me from using the grant money to reimburse the indirect costs of the contractor?

A7. No. The administrative cost prohibition applies to the grant recipient's indirect costs and not to costs the grantee incurs under a contract for eligible programmatic costs.

Q8. If my organization is successful in obtaining a BF AWP grant, will EPA reimburse me for the costs incurred for a consultant to prepare our grant proposal?

A8. No. Costs for preparing proposals are an unallowable administrative cost.

Q9. If an applicant names a contractor or consulting firm as a "partner" in the proposal is it possible to award that firm a sole source contract on that basis?

A9. No. All contracts for professional services must be awarded competitively to the maximum extent practicable and in compliance with requirements to consider small and disadvantaged businesses and cost or price analyses. The market for consulting and legal services is robust and it is unlikely that competition is impractical.

Q10. Per evaluation criterion 5. "Community Partnerships and Engagement," is an applicant allowed to include on their list of project partners an organizational partner that already is or will be involved in the BF AWP project, but then also pay that organizational partner like a consultant to assist with completing some of the eligible BF AWP activities?

A10. It depends. If an applicant's organization partner is eligible to receive EPA grant funding under this RFP (see RFP Section 3.A. Who Can Apply?), then the organizational partner may be eligible to receive a subaward of financial assistance to perform some of the BF AWP activities. The subaward would be subject to the Uniform Grant Guidance and EPA's grant regulations; see EPA's subaward policy at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/grants-policy-issuance-gpi-16-01-epa-subaward-policy-epa-assistance-agreement-recipients>. However, the partner could not function as a "consultant" to assist the applicant in a manner similar to that of a commercial vendor of

professional services, such as providing consulting services on a profit-making basis in the commercial marketplace.

Applicants who include an organizational partner who will provide consultant services to the BF AWP project on commercial terms must identify that partner as a contractor rather than a subawardee. Applicants must select contractors for the project using competitive procurement requirements. See EPA's list of standard solicitation clauses at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses#Contracts and Subawards>. Naming any entity providing commercial services as an organizational partner in the proposal does not exempt the transaction from competition requirements.

Q11. If my proposal is selected for EPA grant funding, will EPA reimburse me for eligible programmatic costs I incurred prior to the award of the grant?

A11. It depends. EPA may reimburse successful applicants for pre-award costs incurred up to 90 days prior to award, even if the applicant did not request prior approval to incur pre-award costs, provided the costs are eligible, allowable, and included in the approved budget and workplan for the grant. For example, costs for contracts are allowable only if the contract was entered into in a manner that complies with the competitive procurement provisions of EPA's grant regulations.

Please note that applicants incur pre-award at their own risk and that EPA is not obligated to reimburse applicants for pre-award costs that are not included in the workplan and budget the Agency approves. EPA is under no obligation to reimburse applicants for pre-award costs if the applicant does not receive an award or if the amount of the award is less than the applicant anticipates.

Q12. Can BF AWP Program grant funds be used to complement other brownfields or related funding provided by the state for work in the same project area?

A12. Yes. This EPA grant can complement state funding for brownfields or related work within the same project area. However, the applicant cannot charge the same costs for the same activities or tasks to both the state funding and federal funding, or duplicate activities under state funding and federal funding. The applicant must clearly distinguish how state funding and federal funding will be used in order to be sure the funds are complementary and not duplicative. Additionally, federal funds cannot be used to manage state funds.

Q13. Can BF AWP Program grant funds be used as a match for a proposed project whose purpose, design and location match the EPA's program, but which would be funded primarily by a state?

A13. It depends on the laws of the state. There is no barrier in federal law for EPA BF AWP program grant funding being used as match for a state grant. Applicants need to determine if the state law allows for federal funding to serve as a match for the proposed project.

Q14. Is there a limit to personnel funds that can be included in the grant proposal budget?

A14. No. While there is no limit on the amount of grant funds that may be used for personnel costs, the overall budget will be evaluated on its cost-effectiveness and reasonableness in achieving the goals of the project.

Q15. Is travel to relevant EPA Brownfield training conferences and workshops, etc. an allowable and eligible use of cooperative agreement funding under this solicitation?

A15. Yes. Travel costs for the recipient's project personnel to attend BF AWP-relevant EPA Brownfield training conferences and workshops are considered an allowable staff training expense under the BF AWP grant program. It is up to the applicant to propose a reasonable portion of the grant budget to cover these types of trips.

Q16. Why does EPA need to approve any site-specific assessment planning or cleanup planning activities prior to allowing the grantee to conduct them?

A16. EPA needs to approve any site-specific assessment or cleanup planning activities because assessment and cleanup planning are considered response activities under CERCLA. Federal grant funding for brownfields assessment and cleanup planning, and other response activities, may only be used at eligible brownfield sites, by recipients who are not liable for the contamination under CERCLA § 107.

Q17. The RFP states on page 9 that site-specific planning for assessment or cleanup at one or more brownfield sites requires EPA approval in advance of a grant recipient being allowed to conduct such activities. Furthermore, the RFP states that these types of activities, if necessary for the project, should constitute a limited portion (not more than 10%) of the BF AWP grant budget. At what point in the BF AWP grant process will EPA determine whether a grant recipient will be allowed to conduct limited site-specific planning for assessment or cleanup activities?

A17. If an applicant who is selected to receive a grant award has included a limited amount of site-specific assessment and cleanup planning activities in their BF AWP project budget, EPA will need to conduct a more robust site eligibility and liability determination before approving these activities for grant funding. The additional approval process will take place during the grant workplanning process, which is after the recipient is selected for award but before the grant award is made by EPA. This additional approval process is needed for each brownfield site where the applicant has requested to do site-specific assessment or cleanup planning.

Whether or not EPA approves site-specific assessment or cleanup planning will be based on site eligibility and liability provisions under CERCLA § 101(39) and § 107. A recipient who is liable for contamination at a specific brownfields site is prohibited from conducting assessment or cleanup planning at that site using EPA grant funds under the BF AWP Program. If EPA finds the site-specific assessment or cleanup planning activities proposed by the recipient are ineligible, the grant amount awarded to the recipient may be reduced.

APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY

Q18. How does EPA interpret “general purpose unit of local government” for the purposes of applicant eligibility under this RFP?

A18. The Agency follows the definitions of “local government” under 2 CFR Part 200 which provides the following: Local government means a county, municipality, city, township, local public authority (including any public and Indian housing agency under the United States Housing Act of 1937) school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (whether or not incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under State law), any other regional or interstate government entity, or any agency or instrumentality of a local government.

Q19. Explain the circumstances under which a state would be considered an eligible applicant for EPA BF AWP Program grant.

A19. A state may be considered an eligible applicant if they can demonstrate they are applying to serve in a grant management capacity role, to manage the fiscal and administrative grant matters, on behalf of a local community who would not otherwise have the resources to apply for or manage the BF AWP grant. The state applying for the BF AWP must demonstrate that the local community will be leading the BF AWP effort. This can be demonstrated by attaching to the proposal a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the state and the local community. State applicants that apply to this RFP and propose a project role other than providing this type of grant management capacity to a local community will not be considered eligible under this RFP.

The MOU should be signed (executed) prior to submitting the grant proposal. If an executed MOU cannot be obtained prior to the grant proposal deadline, the applicant should explain why in their proposal, and submit a copy of the executed MOU separately to EPA as soon as possible but no later than September 16, 2016.

Q20. What is an example of an appropriate role for a regional council or group of general purpose units of local government, given that the BF AWP grant funding cannot be used for regional planning?

A20. A regional council, regional planning commission, or group of general purpose units of local government may appropriately conduct BF AWP grant activities by providing fiscal, administrative and programmatic capacity on behalf of, or by working in partnership with, the local community where the BF AWP project area is located. The leadership and involvement of the local community where the BF AWP project area is located should be evident throughout the project. In those circumstances where it makes more sense for the regional organization to serve as the applicant for the BF AWP project, it is the applicant’s responsibility to clearly articulate the reasons for that in their proposal and demonstrate the extent to which the local community will be heavily involved as a leader or co-leader of the BF AWP process.

Q21. May a non-profit organization provide evidence other than 501(c)(3) documents to demonstrate they are an eligible entity applying for this assistance?

A21. Yes. While 501(c)(3) documents are one way to demonstrate that an applicant is a non-profit, other evidence may be provided. An organization may be incorporated as a nonprofit under state law and not obtained federal tax exempt status but still be eligible for this grant. The evidence an applicant provides must establish that it is recognized as a non-profit in its state of incorporation. Evidence of non-profit status must accompany the proposal.

Q22. Are economic development commissions that are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code eligible for BF AWP grants?

Q22. Yes.

Q23. Are public universities eligible to receive EPA assistance under this RFP?

A23. Yes. Public universities who meet EPA's interpretation of "non-profit organization" described above or who are instrumentalities of a state or tribal government under applicable law are eligible to receive EPA assistance under this RFP.

Q24. Who are the 64 prior recipients of EPA BF AWP grants that are ineligible to apply for the FY17 BF AWP grant funding?

A24. The following is a list of the prior recipients of the EPA BF AWP grant. These entities are ineligible to apply for the FY17 BF AWP grant program, unless they apply as a POWER+ applicant:

BF AWP Grant Recipient	FY10 grantee	FY13 grantee	FY15 grantee
City of Sanford, ME	X		
Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, MA	X		
City of Lowell, MA	X		
Town of Lee, MA		X	
City of Burlington, VT		X	
City of Lawrence, MA			X
City of New Bedford, MA			X
Greater Portland Council of Governments, ME			X
Ironbound Community Corporation, Newark NJ	X		
City of Ogdensburg, NY	X		
Desarrollo Integral del Sur, Inc (DISUR), Puerto Rico	X		
Groundwork Hudson Valley, Yonkers, NY		X	
City of Camden Redevelopment Agency, NJ			X
South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation, NY			X
City of Rochester, NY			X
City of Ranson, WV	X		
City of Roanoke, VA	X		
Borough of Monaca, PA	X		

Philadelphia City Planning Commission, PA		X	
Cumberland County Redevelopment Authority, Carlisle, PA		X	
City of Huntington, WV			X
Temple University, PA			X
City of Atlanta, GA	X		
City of New Bern, NC	X		
Central Florida Regional Planning Council		X	
The Enterprise Center, Chattanooga, TN		X	
Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government, KY		X	
City of Hickory, NC			X
Mississippi Conference of Black Mayors			X
City of Goshen, IN	X		
City of Cleveland, OH	X		
City of Freeport, IL		X	
North Branch Works (formerly LEED Council), Chicago, IL		X	
City of Indianapolis, IN		X	
City of Toledo, OH		X	
City of Green Bay, WI		X	
City of Wausau, WI		X	
City of Janesville, WI		X	
City of Duluth, MN			X
City of St Paul, MN			X
City of Racine, WI			X
Redevelopment Authority of the City of Milwaukee, WI			X
City of Tulsa, OK	X		
City of Shreveport, LA		X	
City of Whitewright, TX			X
City of Kansas City, MO	X		
City of Council Bluffs, IA		X	
City of Dubuque, IA			X
City of Pittsburg, KS			X
City of Kalispell, MT	X		
City and County of Denver, CO	X		
City of Aurora, CO	X		
City of Minot, ND		X	
City of Cheyenne, WY			X
City of Phoenix, AZ	X		
San Francisco Parks Alliance, CA	X		
Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation, San Diego, CA	X		

Communities for a Better Environment, Huntington Park, CA	X		
Environmental Health Coalition, National City, CA		X	
City of Fresno, CA			X
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, WA	X		
City of Vancouver, WA		X	
City of Spokane, WA			X
City of St Helens, OR			X

Q25. Please tell me more about the POWER+ Initiative. What does it mean to apply for a BF AWP grant as a POWER+ applicant?

A25. The White House has two fact sheets on POWER+ Initiative (Partnerships for Opportunity and Workforce and Economic Revitalization):

- The President's [FY2016 budget describes the POWER+ plan](#)
- [White House fact sheet on POWER+ Initiative and grants \(Oct 2015\)](#)

EPA recognizes that communities who have recently experienced or will soon experience closure of a coal-fired power plant may be interested in applying for a BF AWP grant, because a closed or closing coal-fired power plant, or related legacy brownfield site(s), is likely to quickly become a large, blighted area that the community needs to address.

For the purposes of the EPA's FY17 BF AWP grant competition, an applicant can be considered as a POWER+ applicant if they clearly demonstrate that their proposed BF AWP project area includes an eligible catalyst, high priority brownfield site and a recently closed (2008 or later) or closing coal-fired power plant.

Applicants should review the list of Other Factors (Section 5.B. of the RFP), and indicate on the Other Factors checklist (Appendix 2 of the RFP) and within their proposal whether the POWER+ designation applies to their proposal.

Q26. Why are prior recipients of the BF AWP grant ineligible to apply for a BF AWP grant in FY17 (with the exception of POWER+ applicants)?

A26. Since the BF AWP grant program is still relatively new, the EPA wants to maximize the opportunity to provide this grant funding to a wide audience as one way of growing BF AWP grant program. Prior recipients have already completed (or are in the process of developing) their brownfields area-wide plans, and their next steps will need focus on how to implement the plans now in existence (and not to only continue with planning efforts). For these same reasons, we have not allowed prior BF AWP grant recipients to apply in either the FY13 or FY15 grant competitions.

There is one exception: EPA is allowing prior BF AWP grant recipients to apply to the FY17 BF AWP grant competition as a POWER+ applicant, if they are interested in doing so. This is one way that EPA supports the White House Administration's efforts to help communities who

struggle with how to revitalize areas affected by recently closed or soon to be closing coal-fired power plants.

Q27. May an entity apply for BF AWP grant funding if they are the recipient of another EPA grant?

A27. Yes. An applicant may apply for this round of BF AWP Program grant funding even if they have received another grant from EPA (unless they are a recipient of a FY10, FY13, or FY15 BF AWP grant – see questions above). However, applicants cannot include within their BF AWP proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant.

Q28. If the project area affected by brownfield(s) (such as the neighborhood, district, local commercial corridor, city block, community waterfront, etc) is part of multiple jurisdictions, is the project area still eligible to receive a BF AWP Program grant?

A28. Yes. A multi-jurisdictional project area that is affected by brownfields is eligible to receive this EPA grant.

Q29. Can two nearby communities apply together to receive one BF AWP Planning grant?

A29. Two communities can apply together only if one community is named as the lead "applicant" and the other community is named a "partner" or "co-applicant." EPA will only award funds to one eligible applicant (the lead applicant) as the "recipient." (This recipient may not be a FY10, FY13, or FY15 BF AWP grant recipient, unless they are a POWER+ applicant). The recipient is accountable to EPA for the proper expenditure of funds and is also responsible for working closely with EPA throughout the grant project period.

If the lead applicant chooses, they may use their EPA funding to provide subawards of financial assistance, which includes using subawards to fund partnerships, provided the recipient complies with applicable requirements for subawards including those contained in 2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500 as appropriate.

Q30. May my organization submit more than one proposal?

A30. Yes. Applicants may submit more than one proposal so long as each one is for a different project area and is submitted separately to EPA.

Q31. Are Alaskan Native Regional Corporations and Alaska Native Village Corporations eligible to apply for EPA assistance under this RFP?

A31. Yes.

Q32. Are Alaskan native communities eligible to apply for EPA grant funding under this RFP?

A32. No. EPA may only award grants under CERCLA 104(k)(6) to an "eligible entity" as that

term is defined in CERCLA 104(k)(1) or a "nonprofit organizations" as that term is defined in Section 4(6) of the Federal Financial Assistance Management Improvement Act of 1999, Public Law 106-107, 31 U.S.C 6101. Alaskan native communities are not among the eligible entities listed in CERCLA 104(k)(1).

However, an Alaskan native community that:

- has formed a non-profit organization, or
- is a unit of local government, or
- other eligible entity under Alaska law with the capacity to enter into a legally binding financial assistance agreement with EPA

is eligible to apply through their designation as an eligible non-profit or unit of government.

Q33. May an eligible entity partner with an ineligible entity within its sphere of influence (e.g., may an eligible city or Alaskan Native Regional Corporation partner with an ineligible Alaskan native community)?

A33. Yes. Eligible entities may include areas which lie within the jurisdiction or boundaries of an ineligible entity (e.g., an Alaskan native community) within the BF AWP project area. The applicant may also propose to partner with the ineligible entity by involving it in the BF AWP planning process. However, if the applicant is successful in receiving BF AWP grant funding, the applicant may not make any subawards with EPA funding to an ineligible entity.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

Q34. Beyond those stated in this RFP, what other solicitation clauses must an applicant review because they apply to this RFP?

A34. In addition to the clauses stated in the RFP, EPA's list of standard Solicitation Clauses also apply. Every applicant should review them at <http://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-solicitation-clauses>.

Q35. What is the maximum amount of money that an applicant may be awarded?

A35. An applicant may be awarded up to \$200,000 in EPA grant funding.

Q36. How do I get help in understanding and responding to the RFP?

A36. Applicants should first review information on the EPA's brownfields website at <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields> and at <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/types-brownfields-grant-funding#tab-5>. EPA staff may provide pre-proposal assistance to individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility and submission requirements only. Contact information for EPA staff is provided in Section 7 of the RFP. In accordance with EPA's Competition Policy, EPA staff will not meet with individual applicants to discuss draft proposals. Agency personnel will not review or comment on proposals drafted by potential applicants.

Q37. What are the important deadlines?

A37. Proposals are due on August 10, 2016. Proposals submitted electronically must be received by www.grants.gov by 11:59pm Eastern Time on August 10, 2016 to receive consideration.

Q38. What is the project period for awards?

A38. The maximum project period is 24 months. Applicants should plan for project completion in 24 months per the cooperative agreement terms and conditions. At a time as specified in the cooperative agreement terms and conditions, the EPA will make a determination as to whether the recipient has made sufficient progress in implementing its BF AWP project.

Q39. What is the EPA's anticipated schedule for making award decisions?

A39. EPA anticipates making award decisions in November 2016. Applicants who fail to meet threshold criteria will be notified by September 2016.

Q40. Will pages beyond the specified page limits, attachments beyond the required attachments and/or any extraneous materials be considered if included in the proposal submission?

A40. No. Pages beyond specified page limits, attachments beyond the required attachments and/or any extraneous materials will not be considered. See Section 4.D. in the RFP.

Q41. What are the page limitations?

A41. See Section 4.D. in the RFP for full details. In short:

- Narrative Proposal (17-page limit). Includes:
 - cover letter (2-page limit) and
 - detailed project description (15-page limit)
- Project milestones schedule (1-page limit)
- No page limits for:
 - Responses to threshold criteria
 - Letter(s) of commitment to the project
 - Leveraging documentation
 - Other Factors checklist
 - SF-424 form

Q42. Per the "Application for Federal Assistance" (SF-424), what is the "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number" and the "CFDA Title"?

A42. The "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number" is 66.814 and the "CFDA Title" is Brownfields Training, Research, and Technical Assistance Grants and Cooperative Agreements. See page 1 of the RFP.

Q43. How should applicants respond question 19 on the SF-4242 "Application for Federal Assistance"?

A43. Question 19 on the SF-424 references Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. This review is not required with the initial application and as such, applicants should not answer question 19. However, this intergovernmental review may be applicable to awards resulting from this solicitation. Applicants selected for funding may be required to provide a copy of their proposal to their State Point of Contact (SPOC) for review, pursuant to Executive Order 12372, Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs. Not all states require such a review.

Q44. How is the EPA BF AWP Program related to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Transportation (DOT)?

A44. The BF AWP grant program is an integral part of the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities. Please visit www.sustainablecommunities.gov for details about the program and agency-specific information.

Q45. Per the RFP section describing the “Link to the HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities”, can you clarify what each of the six Livability Principles means?

A45. The six HUD-DOT-EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities Livability Principles are described below. More information is available at <https://www.sustainablecommunities.gov/mission/livability-principles>.

1. Provide more transportation choices - Develop safe, reliable, and economical transportation choices to decrease household transportation costs, reduce our nation’s dependence on foreign oil, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote public health.
2. Promote equitable, affordable housing - Expand location- and energy-efficient housing choices for people of all ages, incomes, races, and ethnicities to increase mobility and lower the combined cost of housing and transportation.
3. Enhance economic competitiveness - Improve economic competitiveness through reliable and timely access to employment centers, educational opportunities, services and other basic needs by workers, as well as expanded business access to markets.
4. Support existing communities - Target federal funding toward existing communities—through strategies like transit-oriented, mixed-use development and land recycling—to increase community revitalization and the efficiency of public works investments and safeguard rural landscapes.
5. Coordinate and leverage federal policies and investment - Align federal policies and funding to remove barriers to collaboration, leverage funding, and increase the accountability and effectiveness of all levels of government to plan for future growth, including making smart energy choices such as locally generated renewable energy.
6. Value communities and neighborhoods - Enhance the unique characteristics of all communities by investing in healthy, safe, and walkable neighborhoods—rural, urban, or suburban.

As part of the evaluation criteria, proposals will be evaluated on the degree to which they will advance the Livability Principles.

Q46. What are some examples of sustainable and equitable development outcomes that communities can consider as part of their EPA BF AWP and other brownfields grants?

A46. The EPA encourages applicants to research sustainable and equitable cleanup and reuse approaches, and incorporate them into their proposed BF AWP project. Sustainable and equitable approaches can ensure brownfields are cleaned up and reused in ways that:

- contribute to greener and healthier homes, buildings, and neighborhoods;
- mitigate environmental conditions through effective deconstruction and remediation strategies which address solid and hazardous waste, and improve air and water quality;
- improve access by residents to greenspace, recreational property, transit, schools, other nonprofit uses (e.g., libraries, health clinics, youth centers, etc.), and healthy and affordable food;
- improve employment and affordable housing opportunities for local residents;
- reduce toxicity, illegal dumping, and blighted vacant parcels; and
- retain residents who have historically lived within the area affected by brownfields.

Q47. How does area-wide planning for brownfields assessment, cleanup and reuse tie to improving local public health?

A47. Through the BF AWP process, a community has the opportunity to research existing conditions in the project area (including public health conditions) and work with local stakeholders to develop a plan/strategy for assessing, cleaning up and reusing brownfield sites. For example, a community may want to research and analyze existing public health conditions in the BF AWP project area and develop cleanup and reuse priorities around those concerns. EPA strongly encourages applicants to consider how to work with the local public health agency in any research and analysis of the existing public health conditions/risks.

Assessing and cleaning up brownfields protects public health by removing and reducing community exposures to contaminants found on brownfields (i.e., petroleum, lead, arsenic and other metals as well as asbestos, PAHs, VOCs, PCBs; as well as construction and demolition debris, illegally dumped wastes, and pesticides). Addressing a brownfield through assessment and cleanup can also help protect humans from exposure to biological contaminants such as cryptosporidium, hepatitis A, E. Coli bacteria, giardia, etc., when active or recently decommissioned septic tanks, cesspools or defective sewer lines are removed from a site in an area where these structures are contaminating well water.

Q48. What are examples of how my local and state public health agencies can be involved in my BF AWP project?

A48. Local and state health agencies can help identify health risks associated with specific sites or areas, particular sensitive populations (i.e., children, pregnant women, and the elderly) or certain redevelopment options that require special consideration (i.e., daycare centers, schools, elderly care or healthcare facilities). These agencies can also assist in risk communication, and

explain to the public about removing exposure pathways through risk-based corrective actions that reduce potential for inhalation, ingestion or dermal contact with contaminants at the brownfield sites. Local and state health agencies and health advocates, using local health data, also can highlight other health risks, such as pedestrian injuries near heavily trafficked roads or other public health issues near brownfields that may be considered where solutions may be available through redevelopment planning.

Q49. Must the applicant own the catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) around which they propose to conduct the grant activities and develop the brownfields area-wide plan?

A49. No. The applicant does not need to own the catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) for the purposes of conducting research, training or technical assistance activities and develop the brownfields area-wide plan.

Q50. Please provide some information about how the EPA expects BF AWP grant recipients to develop and include plan implementation strategies within their brownfields area-wide plan.

A50. As part of the brownfields area-wide plan, EPA expects grantees to identify and include within their plan specific implementation strategies, such as 1) next steps, 2) resources already available and those needed, 3) realistic leveraging opportunities, 4) key partnerships, and 5) a plan implementation steering committee that will endure over the implementation timeframe. These strategies should be designed to lead to on-the-ground brownfields cleanup, reuse and community revitalization transformation. Examples of questions that should be considered for the implementation strategies section include: What is the plan for investment (or investment strategy) for the short, medium and long-term (e.g., 1-2 year, 5 year, and 10 year) timeframes? What are the strategies for obtaining the right type of funding to make the necessary improvements for this area? How do you plan to put together the funding components needed for the priority investments in the area? Which of the key partners will be taking responsibility for leading specific implementation activities for specific parts of the brownfields area-wide plan?

Q51. Will the EPA impose any deadlines on recipients for implementation of the brownfields area-wide plans developed using this EPA grant funding?

A51. No. The EPA will not impose deadlines on the grant recipients for brownfield area-wide plan implementation. Since EPA is not funding implementation of the brownfield area-wide plans, EPA cannot impose a deadline on when the plans will be implemented.

Q52. May an applicant use a brownfields inventory they created under a prior EPA grant to help identify and describe the BF AWP project area and specific catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s)?

A52. Yes.

Q53. May an applicant propose to develop an area-wide plan for an area affected by brownfields which happens to also be part of the same area covered by a different EPA grant (such as a Brownfields Community-Wide Assessment grant)?

A53. Yes. An applicant may propose a BF AWP project area that covers the same, or overlaps with the same, area as another EPA grant. However, applicants must not include within their BF AWP proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant.

Q54. What resources does EPA provide to help communities assess brownfields sites?

A54. EPA provides the following brownfields site assessment resources:

- Brownfields Assessment Grant (national competitive funding opportunity): <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/types-brownfields-grant-funding>
- Targeted Brownfields Assessment: <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/targeted-brownfields-assessments-tba> (contact your EPA Regional Office for more information)
- State and Tribal Response Programs <http://www.epa.gov/brownfields/brownfields-state-local-tribal-information> (contact your state or tribe for more information)

A brownfields site assessment cannot be conducted under a BF AWP grant.

Q55. Are past or current recipients of EPA Brownfields funds more likely to be considered for BF AWP Program grant funds than applicants who have not been awarded any Brownfields funding?

A55. Neither. All applicants will be evaluated based on the criteria listed in the Section 5.A. of the RFP.

The evaluation criteria include evaluation of "Programmatic Capability and Past Performance" which includes managing past or current federal or non-federal assistance agreements similar in size, scope and relevance to the proposed project that the organization performed within the last three years. As such, all applicants will be evaluated on their history of managing past or current federal grants. Those applicants who do not have relevant or available past performance or past reporting information (and so indicate that in the proposal) will receive a neutral score in this area to avoid prejudice.

Q56. If my organization is selected to receive a grant, will the EPA grant project officer be from my EPA Regional office or from EPA's Headquarters Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization in Washington, D.C.?

A56. EPA grant projects officers will be in the appropriate EPA Regional office. EPA Regional project officers will coordinate with staff in the EPA Office of Brownfields and Land Revitalization (headquarters office).

Q57. How will my proposal be evaluated?

A57. If your proposal is received by the closing date and time as listed in the RFP, your proposal will be evaluated by staff from EPA and staff from relevant federal agency partners. There are two different types of criteria: threshold criteria and evaluation criteria. Threshold and evaluation criteria are clearly indicated in the RFP. If a proposal fails to meet any of the threshold criterion listed in Section 3.C., the proposal will be disqualified from further consideration and the applicant will be notified. However, EPA representatives may seek clarification from an applicant regarding its response to a threshold criterion. EPA will not seek clarification of responses to any evaluation criteria.

For proposals that pass threshold criteria review, national evaluation panels will assess how well each proposal meets the evaluation criteria outlined in Section 5.A. of the RFP. The national evaluation panels will be comprised of EPA staff and may include representatives from other federal agencies. Each proposal will be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria and rated under a points system, with 100 total points possible. Scores on each evaluation criterion will be totaled to determine the national evaluation panel's recommended proposal rankings.

EPA senior management at Headquarters, as the EPA Selection Official, will take into consideration the recommendations of the national evaluation panels when making final selection and funding decisions.

EPA's Selection Official may consider the "Other Factors" listed in Section 5.B. of the RFP. Applicants must complete and submit the Other Factors Checklist and attach supporting documentation as needed, as described in the RFP (Appendix 2), as part of their proposal submission. This information will not be considered by the EPA Selection Official unless appropriate documentation is attached to the proposal. The EPA may verify these disclosures prior to selection.

Q58. For the purposes of the evaluation criterion 1. "Community Need" what are examples of the types demographic information I could provide in my proposal about my community, and where do I find demographic information about my community?

A58. The EPA requests applicants provide census-based demographic data to the extent possible, as well as other data or additional information that provides a compelling explanation of community need and why the brownfields area was selected for this project. To assist applicants with finding potentially relevant and appropriate information, the EPA is providing the following weblinks as authoritative sources of health, environmental and demographic information which may be useful to consider in preparing your proposal. Applicants should select the type of demographic information to support their proposals based on their assessment of what information will make the best case that their community needs BF AWP grant funding. The below are examples only; applicants may choose to provide different or additional information. The applicant is responsible for assessing the importance of types of demographic information that will best describe the specific challenges of the community being served.

The EPA does not require that applicants include the “sample format for demographic information” provided as an example in ranking criterion 1.

Economic & Social data examples include:

- Low property values
- Low tax base for the community
- Percentage of the community unemployed/underemployed
- Percentage of the community below the poverty line
- Factors that make leveraging funds for the project difficult
- Percentage of community on welfare

Tools for locating this information for your community:

- [Fedstats.gov](http://www.fedstats.gov): this website provides links to all relevant agencies based on your search criteria, such as income, health, labor, education, and crime levels and allows you to search by state as well.
- [Census.gov](http://www.census.gov): this website is the home page of the U.S. Census Bureau and provides statistics on economics, employment, health, housing, employment, and other categories. You can search by state, and find detailed reports on each state.
- [FactFinder.census.gov](http://factfinder.census.gov): this webpage provides information on a more specific area than Census.gov. You can search by state, but also by zip code to find statistics on your specific community.
- US Census Bureau, US Department of Commerce: American Community Survey, <http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, US Department of Labor, <http://www.bls.gov/>: Provides national, state and local unemployment and employment data. <http://www.bls.gov/bls/unemployment.htm>

Health/Welfare/Environment data examples include:

- Asthma rates among children
- The incidence of illness amongst the population in contact with the site
- Cancer, diabetes, obesity rates in the community
- Health care access
- Teen pregnancy rate
- Number of vulnerable inhabitants (women of child-bearing age, children, the elderly)
- Information showing that the targeted community is disproportionately impacted by the environmental issues of the site (e.g. sizes and numbers of brownfields sites, suspected or known level of contamination, past uses of the site, etc.)
- Crime rate
- Education levels and other education statistics (e.g. graduation rate, dropout rate)

Tools for locating this information for your community:

While not exhaustive, many authoritative public health information sources from the Department of Health and Human Services Agencies, US EPA, US Census and other sources are listed below.

- Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA): Provides state profiles for medical professional shortage areas and grants for health care <http://datawarehouse.hrsa.gov/>
- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR): ATSDR has toxicity profiles, health consultations and education tools at: <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS): CDC has a National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) that includes national birth and death statistics. <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss.htm>. A FastStats section provides summary statistics and links to State and territorial data sources on:
 - Asthma <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/asthma.htm>
 - Diabetes <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/diabetes.htm>
 - Heart disease <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/fastats/heart-disease.htm>
- National Institutes of Health (NIH), National Cancer Institute (NCI): NCI has a webpage that provides State specific cancer statistics, <http://statecancerprofiles.cancer.gov/>

Cancer trends and maps can also be found at that site.

- NIH, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases: NIDDK compiles and presents national diabetes statistics on the following website: <http://diabetes.niddk.nih.gov/populations/index.htm>
- Office of Minority Health, Department of Health and Human Services: General health and racial, and health disparities data can be found at: <http://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/>
- Indian Health Service, Health Promotion Disease Prevention, <http://www.ihs.gov/hdpd/index.cfm>
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD): Grants for community lead hazard abatement, training and to support creating healthy homes. <http://www.hud.gov/offices/lead/> and other community programs http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/comm_planning

US Environmental Protection Agency

- Air Quality Index, <http://www.airnow.gov/>
- America's Children and the Environment, <http://www.epa.gov/ace>
- Cleanups in My Community, <http://iaspub.epa.gov/Cleanups/>
- Fish/ Shellfish Advisories, <http://www.epa.gov/choose-fish-and-shellfish-wisely/fish-and-shellfish-advisories-and-safe-eating-guidelines>
- Radon Zone Map, <http://www.epa.gov/radon/find-information-about-local-radon-zones-and-radon-programs#radonmap>
- Toxic Release Inventory, <http://www.epa.gov/toxics-release-inventory-tri-program>
- State and Territorial Environmental Agency links, <http://www.epa.gov/home/health-and-environmental-agencies-us-states-and-territories>

- Water, Where You Live map. : <http://watersgeo.epa.gov/mywaterway/>;

Here is a sample format for organizing information about public health or EJ concerns in the BF AWP project area in your proposal. The EPA does not require that applicants include use this format in their proposals.

Public Health and/or EJ concern in your community	Source of public health/EJ concern (e.g., contamination or potential contamination)	Type(s) of Contamination & exposure route	Receptors and/or Sensitive Groups	Long-Term Intervention Strategy (based on projected reuse of the site)

Q59. What project start date should an applicant use when creating the project milestone schedule?

A59. Applicants may indicate a project start date of March 2017 or later. Keep in mind that the maximum project period is 24 months. If recipients have not received their grant award by March 2017 EPA will work with the recipients to appropriately adjust the project milestones schedule if needed.

Q60. May an applicant cite other EPA grants they have received for projects that lie within the same brownfields project area as leveraged funds?

A60. Provided there is a strong nexus between the other EPA grant(s) to the proposed BF AWP project, the applicant may list other EPA grants they have (as well as other sources of funding) within the same brownfields project area as leveraged funding. However, applicants cannot include within their BF AWP proposal any duplicate tasks or activities that are part of another EPA grant. Please closely review evaluation criterion 7. “Leveraging” for how to properly include leveraging sources.

Q61. To whom should the letters of commitment be addressed?

A61. The letters of commitment should be addressed to the applicant, as the letters are being written to support the applicant’s project and demonstrate commitment to it. Please note each letter of commitment must be submitted with your proposal. Letters of commitment submitted separately from your proposal will not be accepted.

Q62. Per the evaluation criterion 5. “Community Partnerships and Engagement” what if an applicant’s engagement with the community has resulted in an existing, inclusive and collaborative community revitalization effort within the proposed BF AWP project area, but has not labeled that effort specifically as “brownfields area-wide planning”?

A62. The applicant should clearly describe in the proposal how the existing, inclusive and collaborative effort underway in the project area includes consideration of the catalyst, high priority brownfields sites and include when the effort was initiated ,the effectiveness of the effort to-date, including recent accomplishments. The applicant should further describe how the BF AWP grant funding requested will serve as the next logical steps to the ongoing project area revitalization effort, and why it will further prepare the community to implement the brownfields area-wide plan once completed.

Q63. What does EPA mean by “assistance agreements” under the evaluation criterion 6. “Programmatic Capability and Past Performance”?

A63. The EPA uses the term "assistance agreement" to describe a federal grant or cooperative agreement. When EPA transfers funds for a public purpose, it uses a legal instrument called an assistance agreement, which may be in the form of a grant or cooperative agreement. Under this criterion, the EPA is requesting applicants to submit a list of up to five grants or cooperative agreements, from the last three years that were funded by federal agencies, where the funding received was similar in size, scope, and relevance to the proposed project. If your organization has not received federal funding before, you may include information regarding projects funded by non-federal entities such as state, tribal or local governments or private foundations.

Q64. How can I obtain a copy of a successful grant application that was awarded BF AWP grant funds under one of the prior grant rounds (FY10, FY13, or FY15)?

A64. EPA can provide you with a copy of a previously submitted grant application that was awarded if you submit a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request (<http://www.epa.gov/foia/>). EPA does not make them available otherwise. FOIA requests take several weeks to process.

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

Q65. Why is a map of the project area required per threshold criterion 2?

A65. An applicant must submit a legible map, with scale and street-level detail, to clearly show the size/shape of the BF AWP project area, and provide a visual to how this project area fits into the larger city or community context. A map no bigger than a standard letter-sized page is all that is allowed.

Q66. Per threshold criterion 2 and evaluation criterion 2. “BF AWP Project Description” what is an appropriate project area size, and an appropriate number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites, that an applicant should identify for their BF AWP project?

A66. It depends. Neighborhoods, downtown districts, city blocks, community waterfronts, local commercial or industrial corridors, etc vary in size, as do the brownfields that affect them. It is the responsibility of the applicant to carefully and thoughtfully delineate and describe in their proposal an appropriate project area size and a reasonable project approach, given the specific project area and community challenges, project goals, stakeholders involved, number and size of

catalyst, high priority brownfield sites, and amount of EPA and/or other leveraged funding available for the project.

Applicants must describe the project area in their proposals (per threshold criterion 2) and demonstrate that the area is affected by a single large or multiple brownfields sites. Catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) are the specific brownfield site(s) identified by the community which, once remediated and reused, have the strongest potential to spur additional revitalization within the area. The proposal must describe why these specific brownfield site(s) are the properties around which the applicant will focus their BF AWP project efforts.

Applicants must identify one specific catalyst, high priority brownfield site per threshold criterion 3. Additional catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) should be identified and described in evaluation criterion 2. “BF AWP Project Description.”

Successful applicants will have identified and described a reasonable number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites and a more focused BF AWP project approach, given project area size and limited amount of grant funding available. It is the responsibility of the applicant to make the case in their narrative proposal that the number of catalyst, high priority brownfield sites they put forward is reasonable, given the project budget, cost effectiveness of their project approach, and the unique characteristics of their project area. Applicants are advised to make sure they do not spread their resources too thinly. If the applicant cannot develop a focused BF AWP project because the project area size is too large or they have identified too many catalyst, high priority catalyst sites, then they are encouraged to designate only a portion of the large district, neighborhood, corridor, etc when submitting their BF AWP proposal.

BF AWP grant funding cannot be used for city-wide, comprehensive or regional planning.

Q67. If an applicant identifies that a National Priorities List (NPL), federally-owned, or other site ineligible for funding under this RFP exists within the BF AWP project area, will the proposal be disqualified?

A67. No. The project area affected by one or more catalyst, high priority brownfield sites may also contain a NPL, federal facility, and/or other site that does not meet the definition of “brownfield site.” However, a NPL, federally-owned, or other non-brownfield must not be proposed as a catalyst, high priority site. Such non-brownfields sites are ineligible for funding under this RFP. Therefore, while the project area may contain such sites, EPA’s grant funding for BF AWP activities cannot be used to for any site reuse planning activities, such as site reuse planning, programming, charrettes, etc., at any ineligible site.

Q68. Can an applicant propose a site to be a catalyst, high priority brownfield site(s) even if they have do not have prior documentation from the state or EPA that it is a brownfield site, nor do they have preexisting information about the environmental conditions of the site?

A68. Yes. An applicant can propose a site to be a catalyst, high priority brownfield site if they suspect the site is contaminated and they know the site is not ineligible for funding under

CERCLA §101 (39) (see threshold criterion 3 and Appendix 3 for more information about threshold information required for the proposed catalyst, high priority site). However, the EPA strongly encourages all applicants to consult with the EPA Regional Brownfields Contact listed in Section 7 in the RFP on all site eligibility questions well prior to submitting a proposal for this grant.

Q69. Is a former National Priorities List (NPL) site that was delisted by EPA considered an eligible catalyst, high priority brownfield site for the purposes of the BF AWP grant program?

A69. A site that EPA has deleted from the NPL or a property on an Operable Unit that has been “partially deleted” from a Superfund site may be eligible to be a catalyst, high priority brownfield site if the site meets the other eligibility requirements as described in Appendix 3 of the RFP. A site that is listed or proposed for listing to the NPL is not eligible.

USING Grants.gov

Q70. Where do I find information about using www.grants.gov to submit my proposal?

A70. Please carefully review Section 4 of the RFP for important information and timeline related to submitting your BF AWP proposal. All proposals must be submitted through www.grants.gov by the deadline.

Also carefully review the “Tips for Submitting Proposals through www.grants.gov for the FY17 Brownfields Area-Wide Planning Grant Competition” which is available at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-04/documents/tips_for_submitting_fy17_bf_awp_proposals_through_grants-gov_0.pdf.